

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-6 are pending.

The rejection of claims 1-6 as obvious over PCT Application No. WO 98/11714 of Hackett et al. is respectfully traversed. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03. In the present case, the prior art does not meet this standard.

Claims 1-6 relate to a surveillance monitoring camera. More particularly, the claims concern a surveillance monitoring camera comprising a storage device. The built-in storage device saves image signals taken by the surveillance monitoring camera in order to display the image signals after the images are photographed. A hard disk drive, a compact disc recorder, a mini disk, or a memory card can be used as the built-in storage device.

In contrast, Hackett et al. are concerned with a security system for monitoring an Automated Teller Machine using a plurality of general cameras. Each general camera includes a temporary image storage section. The temporary image storage section temporarily stores images captured by the general camera. That is, the temporary image storage section stores the images for a specific frame momentarily. Then, when new images are captured for another frame, the new images are stored by the temporary image storage section, while the previously stored images are deleted therefrom. The old image is not lost, however. Once deleted, the images are transferred and saved automatically on either a main hard drive or a removable hard drive, each of which is external to the general camera.

Thus, the built-in storage device of claims 1-6 is different from the temporary image storage section of Hackett et al. in that the built-in storage device saves images while the image storage section of Hackett et al. is only a temporary location for images. The built-in storage device is more like the main hard drive or the removable hard drive in the Hackett et al. reference, but differs from those hard drives in that the built-in storage device is part of the camera whereas the hard drives of Hackett et al. are

external to the camera. Hackett et al fail to teach or suggest a camera having a built-in storage device that stores and saves images. Because all claim limitations are neither taught nor suggested by Hackett et al., claims 1-6 are not obvious.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Miles Yamanaka", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Miles Yamanaka  
Reg. No. 45, 665

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.  
555 South Flower Street  
Forty-First Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071

Telephone: (213) 892-9200  
Facsimile: (213) 892-9494